DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 333 HE 011 637

AUTHOR Weaving, Anne
TITLE The Significance of Deferment for Students Who Did Not Re-Enrol in 1977 at the University of New South Wales. TERC Research and Development Paper No. 48.
INSTITUTION New South Wales Univ., Kensington (Australia). Tertiary Education Research Centre.
REPORT NO TERC-48
PUB DATE Oct 77
NOTE 29p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Choice: College Students: Dropout Characteristics: *Dropout Research: *Enrollment Influences: Foreign Countries: Higher Education: Institutional Research: Postsecondary Education: Research Projects: *School Holding Power: School Surveys: *Student Mobility: *Transfer Students
IDENTIFIERS Deferment: *Stopouts: *Student Attrition: University of New South Wales (Australia)

ABSTRACT

The findings are presented of a study of 309 students at the University of New South Wales who were granted a deferment in 1976 but did not re-enroll in 1977. Students replied to a questionnaire and were divided into three groups: students attending other universities, students attending any other postsecondary institution, and those not enrolled in any postsecondary institution in 1977. Among findings were that deferment requests have been steadily rising, nearly 75 percent of deferring students who did not take up their place at the University of New South Wales enrolled in other postsecondary institutions, and almost all deferring students believed their year away from study was beneficial. Tables are included on such topics as: reasons for approved deferments: comparative deferment figures for several universities: home residence at time of deferment: and responses to the survey by sex. The survey questionnaire is appended. (PHR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED175333

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PAPER No. 48

ISBN 0313-5543

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF DEFERMENT FOR STUDENTS WHO DID NOT RE-ENROL IN 1977 AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Tertiary Education Research Centre of New South Wales

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ANNE WEAVING

October, 1977

HE 011 637

Tertiary Education Research Centre
University of New South Wales

The enrolment statistics of Australian universities have been showing an annual increase in the number of students requesting deferment of their enrolment. Many intending students like to have a year away from the pressures of academic study but feel more secure doing so if they know their university place is guaranteed. This is especially true if they have been accepted into a faculty with restrictive quotas where their H.S.C. mark might fall below the cut-off point the following year.

Since 1974 the University of New South Wales had adopted a policy of granting a year's deferment provided reasons were given for seeking it, and (Table 1) unless the applicant requested deferment in order to pursue studies in another tertiary institution. It is believed that this policy benefits both the student and the University: the student in terms of increased maturity, consolidation of aims and improved attitudes towards study; and the University because it will be dealing with a more mature and committed student. In 1975 and 1976, however, it became evident that only approximately one quarter of those deferring for one year enrolled in the following year. In 1976, therefore, a pilot study was carried out by the Tertiary Education Research Centre of the University to find out what had happened to the three-quarters of deferring students in 1975 who failed to enrol in 1976.[1] With the knowledge gained from that study, further research was planned to determine any patterns or trends in the field of student deferments. Immediately available was the number of students requesting deferment in 1976 who actually enrolled in 1977. Although the number of successful applications for deferment had almost doubled, the percentage of those who enrolled in 1977 was approximately the same as in 1975 and 1976. (Table 2).

Figures available from other universities show varying percentages of deferring students who enrol the following year (see Table 2). These differences are probably due to geographical, historical or social factors.

In May 1977 a questionnaire was mailed to the 510 students listed by the Admissions Section of the University of New South Wales as having been granted deferment in 1976 but who did not enrol in 1977 (see appendix). It asked if they were currently enrolled in any other educational institution, and, if so, to specify the type -- another university, C.A.E., Technical College, or any other. They were also asked if the course they were studying was the same as the one in which they had originally deferred, and, if not, why they had changed their minds. Those who had not enrolled

in any other institution were asked the reason they had not enrolled in 1977, and whether or not they intended taking up tertiary study at a later date. Everyone was then asked what they considered to be the two most important benefits gained from their year's deferment, and if they had any regrets about not enrolling in 1976. A space was left for any other views the student might wish to express about deferment.

Of the 510 questionnaires sent out, 309 (60.59%) were returned. These were then checked with the Metropolitan Universities Admissions Centre list and University records and the following data were extracted to facilitate analysis:

(a) H.S.C. results
(b) student's original subject preferences
(c) actual subject offered
(d) reason for requesting deferment
(e) place of residence at time of request

It seems possible that many students seek deferment if they are not given their first preference for subject or university. Of the 659 students who applied successfully for deferment in 1976, just over half (50.9%) had been given their first preference compared with approximately three-quarters for the total student population. For the students not given first preference for subject, there seemed to be several ways in which they could try to rectify the matter. Some returned to school in an effort to improve their H.S.C. marks, some were able to enter another university on second round offers, and others enrolled at C.A.E.'s or Technical Colleges where the cut-off point for entry to their particular course was lower than for the universities.

Of the students who returned their questionnaires, 106 actually started another course in 1976, despite requesting deferment (Table 3). Presumably they either regarded deferment as an insurance, providing them with a university place if they found their present course unsatisfactory in any way, or they had been waiting for the results of applications to other institutions. There were 43 students who had started at C.A.E.'s, 16 at Technical Colleges and 11 girls who were training to be nurses. The general impression was that they were interested in following a more specific or practical course leading to a definite career. For example, one student deferring in Arts, went to Cumberland College to study physiotherapy; another who was offered a place in the science faculty, went to the New South Wales Institute of Technology to take a business studies

degree. These were just two of the many students who changed their courses because of better job prospects in their new field.

The students who replied to the survey were divided into three main groups, as in the pilot study:

(i) students attending other universities
(ii) students at any other post-secondary institution
(iii) those not enrolled in any post-secondary institution in 1976.

STUDENTS ATTENDING OTHER UNIVERSITIES

It is likely that the decision to enrol in another university was influenced by four factors:

(a) convenience of locality
(b) the chance to go to the preferred university
(c) the ability to follow a preferred course
(d) a change in the student's preference

Of the 79 students who enrolled at other universities in 1976 or 1977, a large percentage live nearer their present university, or would find it much easier to travel to, than U.N.S.W. This is particularly noticeable with students who live in country areas or the A.C.T. and who are now enrolled at New England, Newcastle, Wollongong or the Australian National University. The question of finance must be linked to a student's choice of university, particularly in the case of country students living near a non-metropolitan university.

Of the 51 students who took a year away from studies but subsequently enrolled in other universities, 11 were able, on re-applying, to get into the university of their first choice in 1977, whereas they had not been offered such a place in 1976. Similarly, several students were accepted for first preference subjects - one girl enrolling at Queensland University to do medicine because the quotas there are less restrictive than at metropolitan universities in New South Wales. (Table 4)

However, the most interesting fact that emerged from analysis of the questionnaire data was the large percentage of students who changed their course preference from that in which they had originally deferred - only one-third enrolled in the same course and nearly half enrolled in something entirely different. Even more surprisingly, the percentage of students changing their course preference was greater among students who

had been given first preference.

Amongst this group of students at other universities, over two-thirds had been given their first preference and their H.S.C. results were comparable with faculty means so it cannot be claimed that their change of mind was due to disappointment or low academic achivevement. It would appear that the year they were away from school pressures, either in employment or travelling in Australia or overseas, gave these students the chance to see themselves and the world into which they would have to fit, more realistically. The majority of them said that they changed their mind about the course they wanted to follow because, on reflection, it seemed more suited to their capabilities or interests, and many believed that their new course would provide them with more job opportunities on graduation.

Not one student regretted the year away from study and the greatest benefit was seen as a chance to develop personal maturity. Many of the respondents added that the year had been invaluable and suggested that deferment should be much more the accepted practice for school-leavers planning any form of post-secondary education.

STUDENTS AT C.A.E.'S AND OTHER POST-SECONDARY INSTITUTIONS

As in the pilot survey, this group represents nearly half the total sample and the students enrolled in a wide range of institutions: 74 at C.A.E.'s, 41 at Technical Colleges, 13 training to be nurses, and the remainder are pursuing a variety of courses involving on-job training, such as accountancy. Over half the students who requested a year's deferment in 1976 actually started another course that same year and one can only surmise that they requested deferment before being accepted elsewhere, or used the deferment as an insurance in case their other course proved unsatisfactory.

Also interesting was that a much larger percentage than for either of the other groups live in capital cities (see Table 5). It is likely that these students were more aware of the opportunities offered by C.A.E.'s and other institutions and would find them more readily accessible than would country students. This group differed from the one attending universities in that less than one-third had higher H.S.C. marks than the faculty means and only just over half had been given their first preference. It may be that they believed that the C.A.E.'s offered more appropriate training for their academic ability than did the universities, and that therefore they would have a greater chance of success at such an institution. In their replies and comments there was an emphasis on practical training rather than

on purely academic study, and the current employment situation may have some bearing on this.

Two-thirds of these students, who actually took a year away from studies, had enrolled in entirely different courses from the one in which they had requested deferment and, as in the university group, the main reasons given were that their present course was more suited to their capabilities, or that there were better job prospects at the end of their training. Seven students had enrolled in part-time courses and were combining on-job training with the appropriate study. All of them felt that their year's deferment had given them a chance to view both themselves and the world of work in a more mature way.

For the deferring students, the pattern of response to the questions on what they did during the year, what they gained by deferment, and whether or not they regretted not enrolling in 1976, was almost identical to the deferring university group. Over half of them had been in employment for most of the year and many of them had travelled around Australia or overseas. The greatest benefit was again seen as the chance for personal maturity, but work experience was given as the next most important aspect of the year away rather than a break from study. As many of these students had worked in jobs related to their present courses one can see that work experience would be seen to be important and relevant to them.

Only two of the deferring students regretted not enrolling in 1976, and these were girls who had babies during the year - one can draw one's own conclusions about this! A few were undecided whether or not they had done the right thing by not enrolling, possibly because they wondered if they had not missed something by passing up their chance to go to university The majority, however, did not regret their year off and there were enthusiastic comments about the principle of deferment for at least a year between school and post-secondary education.

RESPONDENTS NOT ATTENDING ANY POST-SECONDARY INSTITUTION IN 1977

There were 90 (29.1%) respondents to the survey who said that they were not enrolled in any post-secondary institution in 1977. A factor which distinguishes them from the first year university population as a whole, is the much larger percentage of people who live in rural areas, or places with less than 5,000 inhabitants. (See Table 2) Although only nine people gave their reason for not enrolling in 1977 as lack of finance, another 14 said that they were hoping to achieve "Independent Status" in order to qualify

for assistance under the Tertiary Education Allowance Scheme (T.E.A.S.), and a further 24 said that they were unwilling to give up their present job in order to come to university. When coupled with the fact that 32 of this group requested deferment because of financial reasons, it becomes apparent that the failure of some of these students to enrol is likely to have a connection with the poor economic conditions in some country areas.

Also significant is the fact that only just over half of them had been given their first preference and less than one-third had higher H.S.C. marks than faculty means. These figures are comparable with those of the students attending C.A.E.'s and other institutions but significantly lower than the group at universities.

Nearly one-third of these people say that they have actually lost interest in university study for the time being, and others give reasons for enrolling that suggest that it is unlikely that they will contemplate coming in the future: some have married, three have entered religious orders, and many have found interesting and fulfilling jobs. A quarter, however, said that they intend taking up tertiary study in 1978 and others that they would do so in two or three years time. It is hard to ascertain if these people are really committed to university study but one can assume that at least some of them will return in 1978 when they will be eligible to apply for the T.E.A.S as an independent student.

Again, the greatest benefit of deferring in 1976, was seen as the chance to mature, with the experience of working coming a close second. There were few people, however, who regretted not enrolling at university, and 15 who were undecided about whether they had done the right thing or not. They were mainly concerned that they would be competing for jobs against people with qualifications and that they might well be the losers in a society where qualifications are of such importance.

DISCUSSION

Two particularly interesting points, requiring further discussion, arise from this study. The first is the way in which students list their preferences on their M.U.A.C. forms, and the second is their lack of understanding either of the purpose of deferment as envisaged by the university authorities, or of their chances of gaining a university place at some time in the future if they fail to enrol after their year's deferment.

Only half of the students who requested deferment in 1976 had been given their first preference by M.U.A.C. Because the criterion for selection to the various university faculties is based solely on performance in the H.S.C. examinations, and as some pupils either fill in their forms in a unrealistic way or perform better or worse in the H.S.C. than was predicted, it seems that for some people there is considerable confusion during the time between the publishing of the H.S.C. results and the closing date for any changes to applications for tertiary institutions. They find themselves in the unenviable position of having to decide whether or not to accept a course which is certainly not their first choice, and may not even be their second or third. A smaller number may be under pressure from their parents or peers to enrol in a more prestigious course, such as medicine or law, if their examination performance was better than expected. During the two weeks in which changes of preference can be registered, both the schools and the university departments are closed for the holidays, so there is a likelihood that these decisions may be made without adequate advice or sufficient information. This would be particularly true for the person who lives far from a metropolitan centre or whose family is unaware of the sources of guidance and advice available to them. A hurried and uninformed choice will probably mean that the student has very little idea about the course content, requirements for successful study, or job opportunities open to him on graduation, and this is certainly not the way to embark on a successful university career.

Looking at some of the preferences listed by prospective students on their M.U.A.C. forms, one wonders what factors influenced them in their choices, and what part the schools played in helping pupils to make a realistic and informed selection. Obviously some people are concerned with going to a specific university and some are concerned with the high prestige courses which have very restrictive quotas; in these cases one imagines that pressure from parents or schools is responsible for what appears to be an inappropriate choice. Other preference listing appears almost capricious in the lack of relationship between courses. For example, one student listed Law, Social Work, Commerce, Architecture, Applied Science and Arts - the link between them is only the fact that they can all be studied at university. Lewandowski, Powell and White in their study Wastage Among Successful Students at the University of New South Wales[2] found ample evidence to suggest that lack of advice and guidance in their initial choices, poor motivation and inappropriate career plans were responsible for a great deal of wastage among academically able students. They considered that much more needed to be done to provide intending students with accurate information

about the demands and characteristics of university life.

At the present time there are some encouraging developments taking place in the field of careers advice in State secondary schools. Information is beginning to disseminate through the Careers Advisers Association which was formed two years ago and, as a result of the hard work of a number of people, career education has progressed from the traditional view of it as a way of presenting the pupil with various options for employment or further education, to an awareness of the need to develop the vocational interests of the pupil so that he can make appropriate career decisions based on self-awareness and the options that are open to them. In her report Some Proposals for the Advancement of Careers Education[3] Angela Glover maintains that the overall situation can only be improved by radical changes in policy and legislation. At the moment, recommendations by the Department of Education on careers teaching can be ignored by a school principal who is not prepared to allocate the necessary resources from existing staffing arrangements. Another great problem is the question of who provides advice and information on careers in schools and how much time they are willing to devote to it in relation to their own subject commitments. Apparently, each year between 30% and 40% of career advisers in schools are new to the job because it is not considered a full-time teaching post with a suitable career structure and opportunities for promotion, and these teachers have received no training in giving careers advice. Glover believes that decisions about careers priorities are far too important to be left to the individual school and that the only way for fundamental improvements to take place is for the Department of Education to establish career development as a mandatory part of every child's education. As well as this, teachers must be suitably trained for the job and have the same possibilities for promotion and the same security of tenure as they would have for any other teaching post. She also states that every school needs to have adequate space and facilities in order to carry out an efficient careers advice service.

From comments made by several students who participated in the pilot survey, and who are now successfully in their second year at this University in an entirely different course from the one they originally gave as first preference, it would seem that not only were the schools at fault in their counselling but the students themselves had only hazy ideas about the real world outside their homes and schools. A year spent travelling or in employment made a great difference to their perspective on life and helped them to make a more informed choice about their future. Similar views were expressed again and again by respondents to this survey and it will be interesting to see what proportion of them go on successfully into their

second year. Many students who were originally given their first preference enrolled in a completely different course after their year's deferment, and the majority of them said they had done so because the new course was "more suited to their capabilities". This can be interpreted in several ways and one does not really know what influenced the original choice of these students, or if the present choice is the right one, but it highlights the problems of making a choice at the age of 17 or 18 that will affect the whole of their future life.

Williams and Ainsworth, of the Sydney University Counselling Service, say that one-third of the students dropping-out of their university in the year following matriculation "...may well have benefited from delaying their entry to university until they had acquired greater maturity and life experience...the problem is one of identifying those at risk, and, therefore, likely to benefit from a deferred entry"[4]. Various research projects in both the United States and Great Britain[5] have shown that students who do not come straight from school are more successful as undergraduates than the average student - not so much in terms of level of final achievement, but in the percentages who complete their courses. It is not possible to comment on the results of deferring students at this University as the numbers available for investigation are too small to be significant at the moment; it is also very difficult to obtain reliable statistics about student drop-out rates for the whole University. However, in the next two years it will be possible to follow up the 1976 students who deferred and thus a more complete picture will emerge.

It seems that the onus is on the schools to identify the students who would benefit from deferred entry, but there is an obvious need for much closer links between them and the tertiary institutions. In looking at the remarks made by respondents to this survey it is clear that there is very little understanding of deferment or of university entry requirements. Many prospective students seem unaware of the admission policies of universities and appear to believe that if they do not enrol after their year's deferment, they will forfeit the opportunity for university study. They do not realise that most of them do not need an official deferment - an application a year later through M.U.A.C. would grant them entry to the course in which they deferred unless they were very near the cut-off level for that particular faculty and quotas became more restrictive. They are unaware, too, that universities are taking in a greater number of mature students each year on the principle that a university education should be available to all those who can benefit from it, whatever their age.

To sum up, it appears that schools have a dual role in their preparation of pupils for tertiary education. First, they should encourage the pupil's vocational development and self-awareness so that they can make appropriate career decisions based on their knowledge of the demands and characteristics of university life and of the options open to them on graduation. Secondly, they must be prepared to encourage deferred entry for immature or uncertain students and make it clear that university, or other post-secondary education, is available at any stage of their life that they may want it. Both these aims would be more easily achieved if there was a closer link between the schools and the post-secondary institutions.

SUMMARY

Most of the findings of this survey compare closely with those of the pilot study and certain patterns, connected with deferment, begin to emerge:

1. The percentage of students who request deferment and then fail to enrol the following year has been fairly constant since 1974.

2. Deferments are increasingly being requested not only at this University but at others in Australia. The differences from university to university of the percentages of students who subsequently enrol the following year are probably due to geographical, historical or social factors.

3. Only half of the 659 students requesting deferment in 1976 had been given their first preference. This compares with approximately 70% of the total first-year intake of the University.

4. Nearly three-quarters of deferring students who do not take up their places at this University enrol in other post-secondary institutions. these are divided between universities and other institutions in the ratio of four to seven.

5. There are more country students represented among deferring students than in the first-year intake as a whole.

6. The majority of students who enrol at other universities do so because they live in their vicinity, or would find travelling to them easier than to this University.

7. Despite requesting deferment over half of the deferring students enrolled at other post-secondary institutions in 1976.

8. Of the students who enrolled in other post-secondary institutions, nearly three-quarters obtained lower marks in the H.S.C. examination than the faculty mean in which they were offered a place. Only 58% of these students were offered their first choice on their M.U.A.C. applications.

9. Among the people who are not enrolled anywhere this year, a far higher percentage than is normal for university students live in rural areas or in places with less than 5,000 inhabitants. This group as a whole will have performed less well in the H.S.C. examination than other students in the faculty in which they were offered a place, and only just over half of them will have been given their first preference. Less than a quarter intend to enrol in some post-secondary institution in 1978 and 30% maintain that they have lost interest in university study.

10. With almost no exceptions, the deferring students believe their year away from study to have been of enormous benefit.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank Eve Barrett who designed the questionnaire for this survey, and gave advice on its interpretation.

REFERENCES

1. Barrett, Eve and Powell, J.P. Deferring Students who did not Re-enrol at the University of New South Wales in 1976. R & D Paper No. 44. Sydney: Tertiary Education Research Centre, University of New South Wales, 1976.

2. Lewandowski, K., Powell, J.P., and White, Ruth. Wastage among successful students at the University of New South Wales. Vestes, 1977, 19, 29-32.

3. Glover, Angela. Some Proposals for the Advancement of Careers Education. Unpublished report, 1977.

4. Williams, C. and Ainsworth, G. Influences affecting student discontinuations. Vestes, 19, 20-23, 22.

5. References here include: Orr, L. A Year Between School and University. Windsor: NFER, 1974; Miller, G.W. Success, Failure and Wastage in Higher Education. London: Harrap, 1970; Sanders, C. Aspects of Scholastic Intelligence. ANZAAS Congress, Brisbane, 1951; Astin, A. Personal and environmental factors associated with college dropouts among high aptitude students. Journal of Educational Psychology. 1964, 55, 219, 227.

TABLE 1

REASONS FOR APPROV

Year	Financial & Personal	Travel/Work Experience	Returning to school to improve H.S.C. results
1975	107 (31.66%)	141 (41.72%)	9 (2.66%)
1976	222 (33.69%)	296 (44.92%)	35 (5.31%)

VED DEFERMENTS

	Uncertain of aims	Other	Total
	68 (20.12%)	13 (3.85%)	338
	20 (3.03%)	86 (13.05%)	659

TABLE 2

DEFERMENT FIGURES FOR

UNIVERSITY	1974	1975	1975	19
	Deferments Granted	Subsequently Enrolled	Deferments Granted	Subs Enro
U.N.S.W.	253	64 (25%)	338	95
Sydney	72*	Figures not available	439	Figu ava
Macquarie	144	69 (47.9%)	106	80
New England	37	16 (43.2%)	216	36
Monash	287	120 (41.81%)	353	208
Melbourne	163#	97# (59.51%)	253	Figu ava

* Deferments granted only under exceptional circumstances

\# Faculties of Arts, Science, Law, Medicine, Economics and

17

SEVERAL UNIVERSITIES

76	1976	1977	1977
equently lled	Deferments Granted	Subsequently Enrolled	Deferments Granted
(28%)	659	149 (22.6%)	894
ures not ilable	530	328 (61.89%)	689
(75.47%)	343	63 (18.37%)	278
(16.7%)	547	68 (12.4%)	1367
(58.92%)	462	250 (54.11%)	396
ures not ilable	249	Figures not available	281

l Commerce, only.

TABLE 3

THOSE RESPONDENTS WHO STARTED AT OTHER POST-SECONDARY INSTITUTIONS IN 1976 DESPITE REQUESTING DEFERMENT FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES, PLUS THOSE RESPONDENTS WHO RETURNED TO SCHOOL TO GAIN HIGHER MARKS IN THE H.S.C.

Where they enrolled in 1976	n	Those given first preference by M.U.A.C. 1976	Those not given first preference by M.U.A.C. 1976
Sydney University	7	3	4*
Other Universities (Interstate)	10#	5	5
At C.A.E.'s (excluding N.S.W.I.T.)	29	14	15
At N.S.W.I.T. +	14	8	6
Technical Colleges	16	11**	5
Hospitals for nursing training	11	4	7
Other post-secondary institutions	8	4	4
Returned to school	11	0	11

* 3 had put Sydney as first choice
\# 9 who live in the vicinity of the chosen university
\+ 7 doing traineeships or sandwich courses
** 10 requested deferment while waiting to hear if they had been accepted for on-job training coupled with day-release courses.

TABLE 4

RESPONDENTS WHO DEFERRED ANY POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION IN 1976

Where they enrolled in 1977	n	Those given first preference by MUAC 1976	Those not given first preference by MUAC 1976	1st preferences as %
Sydney University	29	19	10	65.52
Other Universities	22	14	8	63.64
C.A.E.s	31	20*	11	64.52
Technical Colleges	25	13	12	52
Other Institutions	4	1	3	25
Hospitals for nursing training	2	1	1	50
Not enrolled in any institution	90	47	43	52.22

* 9 of these students enrolled at N.S.W.I.T. and 2 at R.M.I.T.

Of the total number of students who sought deferment in 1976 and subsequently enrolled at the University of New South Wales in 1977 (n149) 80 were given their first preference. (53.69%)

TABLE 5

HOME RESIDENCE AT TIME OF DEFERMENT %

	Attending University	Attending Other Institution	Not Attending Post-secondary Institution	1977 First Year Students U.N.S.W.
Number	79	140	90	4,325*
Capital Cities	69.62	78.57	68.89	69.9
60,000	5.06	1.43	0	7.8
30,000 - 60,000	6.33	0	0	3.3
5,000 - 30,000	8.86	6.43	12.22	13.7
5,000	6.33	11.43	13.33	2.8
Rural	3.8	2.14	5.56	.6
Overseas	0	0	0	2.0

* New Undergraduate students at Kensington.

TABLE 6

RESPONDENTS TO THE

RESPONDENTS
At other universities
At other post-secondary institutions
Not at any post-secondary institution

659 students were granted deferment in 1

149 students subsequently enrolled in 19

SURVEY - BY SEX

NO.	MALES	FEMALES
79	44 (55.7%)	35 (44.3%)
140	64 (45.71%)	76 (54.29%)
90	41 (45.56%)	49 (54.44%)

976 - 358 males (54.32%) and 301 females (45.68%)

77 - 91 males (61.09%) and 58 females (38.93%)

APPENDIX

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES

TERTIARY EDUCATION RESEARCH CENTRE

Questionnaire for Persons Deferring University Study in 1976

May 1977

Most of the following questions can be answered by writing the number of the appropriate response in the brackets on the right hand side of the page. Some require an answer in the space provided.

1. Are you currently enrolled in an educational institution?

    1. Yes
    2. No ( )

If you answered YES please answer Qs. 2-5 inclusive.

If you answered NO please answer Qs. 6 and 7.

2. In what type of institution are you now enrolled?

    1. University (specify) . . . . . .
    2. C.A.E./Teachers College (specify) . . . . . .
    3. Technical College
    4. Secondary School
    5. Other (specify) . . . . . ( )

3. What course are you now studying?

. . . . . .

4. Is this course

1. the same as that in which you deferred
2. similar
3. completely different? ( )

5. If you answered (3) to Q. 4, what was the main reason why you changed your course?

1. Better job prospects
2. More suited to my capabilities
3. The course in which I was granted deferment was not my preferred course
4. I can study this course part-time
5. Other (specify) . . . . . ( )

FOR THOSE WHO ANSWERED 'NO' TO Q.1

6. Why didn't you enrol this year?

1. Lack of finance
2. I didn't want to give up my present job
3. I am/was still travelling
4. I am hoping to achieve 'Independent Status'
5. I have lost interest, for the time being, in university study
6. Other (specify) . . . . . ( )

7. Do you intend taking up tertiary study at a later date?

1. Yes, next year - 1978
2. Yes - in 2 or 3 years
3. At some later date
4. I don't know
5. No

ALL ANSWER FROM HERE ON

8. What did you do in 1976?

   1. Returned to school
   2. Started my present course
   3. Travelled overseas
   4. Was in employment most of the time
   5. Other (specify) . . . . . ( )

9. What was the most important benefit you derived from your year's deferment?

   1. Financial independence
   2. A break from study
   3. Personal maturity
   4. Work experience
   5. Other (specify) . . . . . ( )

10. And the second most important? ( )

11. Do you regret not enrolling in 1976?

   1. Yes
   2. No
   3. Undecided ( )

If you have any comments about the deferment scheme would you please write them in the space below.

Name . . . . . .

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.